

# **EXHIBIT 7**

1                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2                   FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
3                   SOUTHERN DIVISION  
4                   Civil Action No. 7:23-CV-00897

5  
6       - - - - - )  
7       IN RE:    CAMP LEJEUNE WATER LITIGATION )  
8       - - - - - )  
9

10                  Thursday, March 27, 2025

11  
12  
13  
14                  Videotaped Deposition of JAY L.  
15                  BRIGHAM, PH.D., a witness herein, called for  
16                  examination by Counsel for Plaintiffs in the  
17                  above-entitled matter, taken at the Offices of  
18                  Keller Postman, 1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite  
19                  1100, Washington, D.C. 20036, pursuant to  
20                  agreement, the witness being duly sworn by  
21                  Joe Strickland, RPR, CRR, CRC, a Certified  
22                  Stenographic Reporter and Notary Public in and for  
23                  the District of Columbia, the proceedings being  
24                  taken down by Stenotype by Joe Strickland, RPR,  
25                  CRR, CRC, and transcribed under his direction.

1 APPEARANCES:

2

3 On behalf of the Plaintiffs Leadership Group:

4

JOHN S. HUGHES, IV

5

Wallace and Graham

6

525 North Main Street

7

Salisbury, North Carolina 28144

8

704-633-9434

9

10 On behalf of the U.S. Department of Justice,  
11 Civil Division

12

CINDY M. HURT, ESQ.

13

HANLEY W. GIBBONS, ESQ.

14

1100 L Street, NW LST 4085

15

Washington, D.C. 20005

16

202-307-5788

17

Cindy.M.Hurt@usdoj.gov

18

Hanley.W.Gibbons@usdoj.gov

19

20

Also Present by Videoconference:

21

Deanna Havai, Motley Rice

22

Dennis Reich, Mark Doby, Sharon Sprayregen,

23

Whitney Wallace, Zina Bash, SPAC, Jmens

24

25

VIDEOGRAPHER: Bradley Loy

## 1                   C O N T E N T S

2                   WITNESS: JAY BRIGHAM, PH.D.

3                   EXAMINATION BY:	PAGE
4                   Mr. Hughes.....	4
5                   Ms. Hurt.....	214

## 6                   E X H I B I T S

7                   EXHIBITS	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
8                   Exhibit 1	Brigham Report: 12-9-2024	44
9                   Exhibit 2	Second Brigham Report: 2-7-2025	113
10                  Exhibit 3	Benz Deposition, 1-10-2023	140
11                  Exhibit 4	Longley Report: 12-2024	154
12                  Exhibit 5	Second Longley Report: 1-13-2025	156
13                  Exhibit 6	Longley Report: 3-17-2025	176
14                  Exhibit 7	Brigham Report: Harrington 2007	188
15                  Exhibit 8	Photo: Mr. and Mrs. McElhiney	190
16                  Exhibit 9	Photo: Mr. McElhiney	191
17                  Exhibit 10	Depository Pages: Well log images	193
18                  Exhibit 11	Partain thesis	197
19                  Exhibit 12	Photos for The Globe	210

21

22

23

24

25

1 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

2 THE WITNESS: No, I have not.

3 BY MR. HUGHES:

4 Q. Okay. In this matter you've had people  
5 assisting you doing the work; correct?

6 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

7 THE WITNESS: I've had people assisting  
8 me. I've also done quite a bit of work. It's a  
9 collaborative effort with my staff.

10 BY MR. HUGHES:

11 Q. And you use the word "staff" in your  
12 report?

13 A. I do.

14 Q. Okay. How many people are covered by  
15 that term, "staff," for purposes of this project?

16 A. The staff includes four of my senior  
17 research associates and then about four more  
18 research associates.

19 Q. Okay. The DOJ was kind enough to  
20 provide us with some supplemental information in  
21 the last day or two. It indicated some people  
22 that I want to ask you about and see if they were  
23 staff or if they were involved in helping with the  
24 work on this project. Okay?

25 A. Okay.

1           Q.     The first is Annemarie Moore.  Do you  
2 know if she was involved?

3           A.     Yes, she was.

4           Q.     And then Clara Barclay?

5           A.     Yes, to a lesser degree.

6           Q.     Jai -- J-A-I Alterman.

7           A.     Yes, Jai Alterman was.

8           Q.     Jennifer Lapp, L-A-P-P?

9           A.     Yes, Jennifer was also involved.

10          Q.     Karen Luu, L-U-U?

11          A.     Yes, she was.  Correct.  Karen was also  
12 involved.

13          Q.     Peter James?

14          A.     Yes.

15          Q.     Rori Cochran?

16          A.     Yes.

17          Q.     Clifford -- gosh, I'm going to spell  
18 this one -- O-R-A-T-O-K-H-A-I?

19          A.     Yes, Oratokhai.  At the beginning, but  
20 he didn't have a lot of involvement.

21          Q.     Sarah, with an H, Casella,  
22 C-A-S-E-L-L-A?

23          A.     Yes, again her -- she was also involved,  
24 more so at the beginning.

25          Q.     Daphne N-G-O?

1           A. Yes, Daphne was last summer.

2           Q. Randy Scott?

3           A. He was also involved.

4           Q. And Jenna Hill -- J-E-N-N-A Hill. Was  
5         she involved?

6           A. Yes, she was.

7                   MR. HUGHES: And when we go off, I can  
8         give you any spellings.

9                   BY MR. HUGHES:

10                  Q. And it looks like the amount of the  
11         bills that your firm has sent to date to the  
12         Government for the work on this cases and out at a  
13         little over \$843,000. Does that sound correct?

14                  A. Yes, approximately correct, yeah. Yes,  
15         excuse me. I should say yes.

16                  Q. At any time -- strike that.

17                   Can you think of any other staff that  
18         helped you on the project besides the ones we  
19         named?

20                  A. The other name that appears on some of  
21         those would be Ari Kelman.

22                  Q. Kelman, the other historian expert the  
23         Government has retained?

24                  A. Yes.

25                  Q. Have you looked at his report?

1 sorry; I did not think he was correct when he  
2 stated that the B29s used the Bosch spark plugs.

3 BY MR. HUGHES:

4 Q. Right. But other parts of his testimony  
5 like about B29s, you were not challenging; fair?

6 A. Again, you know that report was written  
7 18 years ago. I don't remember. I think my  
8 recognition as I sit here today is my primary  
9 point of challenge was the Bosch spark plugs.

10 Q. And he was testifying more than 40 years  
11 after World War II; right?

12 A. If my memory serves me right, that was a  
13 preservation deposition taken in the late 90s.

14 Q. Okay.

15 A. So it would certainly be at least four  
16 decades or more after he would have been stationed  
17 at Harrington Army Airfield.

18 Q. And you would agree that testimony by a  
19 living witness who had gone through historical  
20 events decades earlier can have value? That is a  
21 general statement.

22 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

23 THE WITNESS: Well, again, as a general  
24 statement, I will agree with that. But testimony,  
25 like all historical evidence that historians use,

1       needs to be evaluated. My assignment for the  
2       Harrington Army Airfield case was if TCE was used  
3       or not used. And that is why I focused on the  
4       Bosch spark plug comments, and not really his  
5       other comments about B29s.

6                  I do now recall that he said they had a  
7       TCE vapor degreaser there that had been made, but  
8       we never found any reference to that either. And  
9       there were other discussions. But really the  
10      point of reference and the point of my interest  
11      was the Bosch spark plugs.

12               Q. I understand. Are you aware that there  
13      are oral histories on the U.S. Marines website for  
14      people that served at Lejeune as far back as the  
15      40s?

16               A. I just have become aware of that, yes.

17               Q. Why didn't you review any of those in  
18      connection with any of your work in this matter?

19               A. I did. My staff and I -- myself in  
20      conjunction with my staff, we did an extensive  
21      review of the websites, and I never came across  
22      those oral histories. I never became aware of  
23      them until recently.

24               Q. Have you looked at them now that you  
25      have been aware of them?

1           A. I have not. One of my staff members is  
2 taking a cursory look at some of them.

3           Q. And they're addressed in one of the  
4 Longley's reports, which we will get to him. Have  
5 you reviewed Longley's -- all of his reports?

6           A. Yes.

7           Q. Do you know what a BUMEDS is --  
8 B-U-M-E-D-S?

9           A. I do not.

10          Q. Or NAVNEDS, N-A-V-N-E-D-S?

11          A. I believe I have seen that word, but I  
12 don't recall what it means.

13          Q. Are you aware that there are historical  
14 regulations pertaining to the Navy and to the  
15 operation of its bases and sometimes they are  
16 called by in shorthand things like NAVNED?

17          A. I now realize -- I think you are using  
18 the shorthand. So BUMED might be Bureau of  
19 Medicine.

20          Q. Yes.

21          A. And NAVNED would be navigation -- I  
22 don't remember the rest of it.

23          Q. Do you know whether a complete set of  
24 the historical Navy regulations exists to cover  
25 the only time period from say the 40s to the 80s?

1       of the people that were there?

2           A. As I said, I'm very wary of using  
3 deposition testimony because I see a lot of  
4 contradictions in it. I'm not sure --  
5 Mr. Urquhart said everything that was filled at  
6 Hadnot Point, but then there were a lot of filling  
7 stations all over the base. That seems somewhat  
8 contradictory to me.

9           Q. Do you think the deposition testimony is  
10 something that a historian can consider as part of  
11 methodology?

12          A. It's certainly something you can  
13 certainly consider it, yes.

14          Q. Do you think that sworn affidavits or  
15 sworn declarations under oath are materials that a  
16 historian can consider as part of his or her  
17 historical methodology?

18          A. I think they can be considered. But as  
19 I believe I testified to not too long, they have  
20 to be weighed and considered along with other  
21 sources.

22          Q. And one of the historian's jobs is to  
23 weigh and consider different sources of evidence  
24 and different incoming information; correct?

25          A. Yes.

1           Q.     Okay.  And as additional information  
2       comes in, a historian may, as a matter of  
3       methodology, need to revise, amend, or correct  
4       what they said earlier; right?

5           A.     That's part of a process of historical  
6       writing.

7           Q.     And in this case, Dr. Longley issued an  
8       initial report which identified President Nixon as  
9       having been at Camp Lejeune.  You remember that?

10          A.     Yes, I do.

11          Q.     And your report refuted that and showed  
12       evidence that President Nixon never was at Camp  
13       Lejeune during the time period; correct?

14          A.     Yes, that's correct.

15          Q.     And a supplemental report where he found  
16       that President Kennedy had been at Lejeune in the  
17       60s and I think President Reagan had been at  
18       Lejeune.  Do you remember that?

19          A.     Yes.  Kennedy obviously in the early 60s  
20       and I believe President Reagan was in 1983 after  
21       the Beirut disaster, for lack of a better word.

22          Q.     Before you saw that in Dr. Longley's  
23       report, were you aware that Kennedy or Reagan had  
24       been at Lejeune during the time period?

25          A.     When I was reviewing The Globe, I

1       asked to address -- I'm not saying those are not  
2       important, but they were not germane to what I was  
3       writing about in my report. I could write a  
4       report with all of those types of people visiting.  
5       It would be a very long report, but it certainly  
6       could have been done.

7       BY MR. HUGHES:

8           Q. Don't you think it's germane if there is  
9       an issue, if you go out of your way to say  
10      Dr. Longley was incorrect. President Nixon wasn't  
11      there.

12       MR. HURT: Objection to form.

13       THE WITNESS: Which begs the question  
14      were other Presidents there, but then you don't  
15      even mention that. Do you see what I'm talking  
16      about?

17       MS. HURT: Objection to form.

18       THE WITNESS: I understand your  
19      questions. I just don't know that I agree with  
20      it. We were reviewing Dr. Longley's report for  
21      accuracy and we found these inaccuracies. And so  
22      that's why I wrote about them in my February  
23      report.

24       BY MR. HUGHES:

25       Q. Right. And the reason why Longley had

1 cited to the Nixon photo was he was trying to  
2 establish that major figures would come to Hadnot  
3 and speak and, therefore, servicemembers and  
4 others would come to see them. Do you remember  
5 that topic in Longley's report?

6 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

7 THE WITNESS: I do.

8 BY MR. HUGHES:

9 Q. Okay.

10 A. I do remember that discussion, and I do  
11 not disagree with Mr. Longley that people went to  
12 Hadnot Point to see such speakers. Speakers such  
13 as an important person like a President or a  
14 Governor, Secretary of Defense, whoever it may be,  
15 as well as entertainment. I don't disagree with  
16 the characterization that Hadnot Point was the  
17 center of activity at Camp Lejeune.

18 Q. You don't disagree with that?

19 A. No, my point is that there were other  
20 areas of Camp Lejeune as well.

21 Q. I understand. A historical  
22 methodology -- can we call it a search for the  
23 truth, or no?

24 A. Well, that begs the question: What is  
25 historical truth? You say that every generation

1       writes its own history. That doesn't mean all  
2       past generations were being dishonest.

3           Q.     Right.

4           A.     All historians, whether it is  
5       Dr. Longley, Dr. Kelman, or myself, are doing our  
6       best to seek an understanding of what we are  
7       writing about, doing this kind of public history  
8       or academic history.

9           Q.     You mentioned public history. Do you  
10      agree this there is a category called the public  
11      historian?

12          A.     Yes, I very much agree that there is a  
13       field of public history. There is a journal about  
14       public history. I consider the work that I do,  
15       and those who work for me, as a form of public  
16       history. Public history, I've heard told, is a  
17       very broad area that can include -- a person I was  
18       in graduate school with the Director of the  
19       American Museum at the Smithsonian. That is  
20       public history. People who work there are public  
21       history. There are all kinds of fields of public  
22       history.

23          Q.     Okay. You know if Michael Partain would  
24       be reasonably called a public historian?

25          A.     I believe he -- based upon his

1       activities, research activities and his education,  
2       I think he fits the bill.

3           Q.     Okay. So am I correct that one topic  
4       you and your team were not asked to look at was  
5       the history of the disclosure of information  
6       regarding the opening of ABC Dry Cleaners?

7           MS. HURT: Objection to form and  
8       foundation.

9           THE WITNESS: I want to make sure I  
10      understand your question. So when you say the  
11      disclosure, do you mean previous attempts to  
12      locate information on the opening?

13       BY MR. HUGHES:

14           Q.     What I mean is the contamination is  
15      discovered, according to the timelines, around  
16      1980. Does that match your recollection looking  
17      at the general facts?

18           A.     Yeah, 1980, the early 1980s concern  
19      started to be expressed.

20           Q.     At that point we had some empirical  
21      water sampling and lab analysis of samples from  
22      the base. Do you have a general understanding  
23      that that happened?

24           A.     I do.

25           Q.     Okay. Now, Mike Partain's timeline,

1                   THE WITNESS: Correct.

2                   BY MR. HUGHES:

3                   Q. There are different references to the  
4 total number of people that may have passed  
5 through the gates of Lejeune during that time  
6 period could have been a million people. Have you  
7 seen that?

8                   A. I have seen numbers of around a million,  
9 yes.

10                  Q. And given what I just walked you through  
11 in terms of longevity and dates, would you agree  
12 it's reasonable to conclude that there are  
13 thousands of people alive today that lived or  
14 worked at Lejeune during that statutory time  
15 period?

16                  MS. HURT: Objection to form.

17                  THE WITNESS: Yes.

18                  BY MR. HUGHES:

19                  Q. Okay. And your team has not interviewed  
20 a single one of them; correct.

21                  A. Correct.

22                  Q. Are you aware that there is a  
23 court-ordered repository of documents in this  
24 case?

25                  A. I don't know if I am or not.

1           Q. I take it you've never -- you and your  
2 staff have never gone to look at the documents in  
3 a court ordered repository in this case?

4           A. I know we've never had such an  
5 undertaking, no.

6           Q. Are you aware that sometimes in large  
7 litigations a permanent archive of repository  
8 documents would be created?

9           A. Yes.

10          Q. Would you agree from a historian's  
11 perspective that could be a good thing to help  
12 preserve historical information; correct?

13          A. It's certainly possible, yes.

14          Q. Would you agree that if the court were  
15 to order a permanent repository archive of all the  
16 Lejeune documents and data that have been brought  
17 forward for this litigation, if a court ordered  
18 that, from a historian's perspective that would be  
19 a good thing?

20           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

21           THE WITNESS: Well, as a historian, I'd  
22 like to have everything kept.

23          BY MR. HUGHES:

24          Q. So is that a yes?

25          A. Yes.

1           A. I would go with one of the conclusion  
2         and if I was drafting that sentence on page 26, I  
3         would add the word "likely."

4           Q. Okay. And that's an iterative aspect to  
5         history. Right? The historical method is  
6         sometimes you have to correct things; right?

7           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

8           THE WITNESS: As I said, yes, you do  
9         have to correct things. I said earlier, every  
10        generation likes to write its own history.

11          BY MR. HUGHES:

12          Q. I understand. So in Dr. Longley's case,  
13        he had to correct the Nixon reference; right?

14          A. Yes.

15          Q. And there was a demonstrative photo of a  
16        water buffalo which was captioned as being at  
17        Hadnot, but it wasn't. He had to correct that;  
18        correct?

19          A. Correct.

20          Q. There was a photo of the Holcomb  
21        Boulevard water treatment plant which I believe he  
22        was -- said the photo was dated from one year but  
23        it was actually dated from another year. You  
24        remember that?

25          A. Yes.

1           Q. And in his subsequent reports, following  
2 your identification of those errors, he tried to  
3 fix them; correct?

4           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

5           THE WITNESS: Yes.

6 BY MR. HUGHES:

7           Q. And that's a proper part of an  
8 historical methodology; right?

9           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

10           THE WITNESS: Yes.

11 BY MR. HUGHES:

12           Q. Water buffalos -- on the bottom of page  
13 2 they talk about water buffalos.

14           A. One moment. Okay. I'm there.

15           Q. So first, you reference water buffalos  
16 or water bulls. Where did get the phrase "water  
17 bulls"? Do you remember?

18           A. I do remember. When I was on base in  
19 May of this past year, we were told by Marines  
20 that they call them water bulls. So I put both in  
21 to try to be inclusive.

22           Q. Yes, sir. Okay. Do you have an  
23 understanding of how the historical water buffalos  
24 were filled mechanically. In other words, do you  
25 have an understanding of whether they were filled

1 land.

2 BY MR. HUGHES:

3 Q. On page 26 of your report you cite to  
4 the deposition of Mr. Melts; correct?

5 A. Yes, that's correct.

6 Q. And you cite to how the ATSDR cited to  
7 the Melts deposition; correct? That's at the top  
8 of the page.

9 A. Yes, footnote 75 is reference to the  
10 ATSDR documents.

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. And then that continues into footnote 76  
13 and footnote 77.

14 Q. Are you aware that Mr. Melt's deposition  
15 is linked on the timeline on the website, The Few,  
16 the Proud?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And you are aware that there are places  
19 in that deposition where Mr. Melts testifies to  
20 the effect that ABC was running in 1953; correct?

21 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

22 THE WITNESS: Correct.

23 BY MR. HUGHES:

24 Q. Okay. If we keep going, on page 27 we  
25 have an image on the Camp Lejeune High School

1       yearbook from 1954; correct?

2           A.    Yes.

3           Q.    How did you all find that, if you know?

4           A.    This was -- I was made aware of that by  
5           the DOJ. I went to Classmates.com and bought my  
6           own copy -- reproduction of this document.

7           Q.    Okay. Do you know why the Model and  
8           Hobby Shop ad is reversed on the right-hand side?  
9           It's upside down.

10          A.    Yes, it's really upside-down, and I  
11          don't know why that happened, unless somebody put  
12          the book together wrong.

13          Q.    The viewpoint for that is that the Model  
14          and Hobby Shop, as best you can tell, was on the  
15          same premises as what ABC Dry Cleaners ended up  
16          being on. And so your inference is if the Hobby  
17          Shop was in the yearbook in 1954, then the dry  
18          cleaners couldn't have replaced it for the whole  
19          year of 1954. Is that fair?

20           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

21          BY MR. HUGHES:

22          Q.    Put it in your own words.

23          A.    That's fine. Other documents talk about  
24          that the ABC One Hour Cleaners went in where the  
25          Hobby Shop had been. So my inference is not just

1 based on the yearbook.

2 Q. Okay. And so the difference between the  
3 1953 date and the 1954 date is less than a year;  
4 correct?

5 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

6 THE WITNESS: It would be approximately  
7 ten months.

8 BY MR. HUGHES:

9 Q. And you don't have any knowledge of  
10 whether that ten months makes any significant  
11 difference in the water modeling analysis; right?

12 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

13 BY MR. HUGHES:

14 Q. How are you using the word  
15 "significant"?

16 A. If you look at the reports by the  
17 Plaintiffs' experts on Phase 1, they indicate that  
18 even if you move the start date for ABC ahead or  
19 back by 10 months, the contamination still occurs  
20 and grows and gets to the levels that the ATSDR  
21 estimated using a curve that's pretty similar,  
22 whether it's the 52 days or the 54 days.

23 But the question I'm asking you is, you  
24 don't have an opinion one way or another as to  
25 whether it makes a difference in the analysis;

1           correct.

2           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

3           THE WITNESS: I have done a lot of these  
4 TCE cases and you asked initially about the  
5 Harrington Army Airfield.

6 BY MR. HUGHES:

7 Q. Yes, I did.

8 A. I have a lay person's knowledge, like  
9 fate and transport, and that's all it is. So I  
10 know some time difference can make a little bit of  
11 change, but I'm not qualified to say how much.

12 Q. Fair enough. Then we get to the grand  
13 opening ad on page 28. How did you guys find this  
14 back issue of the Jacksonville Daily News?

15 A. This was provided to me by the  
16 Department of Justice.

17 Q. So when you say that, does that mean  
18 they found it and gave it to you, versus your team  
19 finding it?

20 A. My team looked and looked and looked and  
21 they were unable to find a back issue of the  
22 Jacksonville Daily News.

23 Q. Yes, sir. But then your client found it  
24 for you?

25 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

1                   THE WITNESS: We were looking for it.  
2                   We had heard about it. We couldn't find it. It  
3                   was given to us. We tried to find it again  
4                   ourselves, but we were unable to.

5                   BY MR. HUGHES:

6                   Q. And the yearbook, that's another one you  
7                   couldn't find, your team couldn't find it, but the  
8                   Government could find if for you?

9                   MS. HURT: Objection to form.

10                  THE WITNESS: Again, I don't recall how  
11                  I became aware of the yearbook. I went out, as I  
12                  said, on Classmates.com and was able to view the  
13                  page in question, so I bought it.

14                  BY MR. HUGHES:

15                  Q. But you had been told about this first;  
16                  right?

17                  A. Yeah, I was provided with the entire  
18                  page.

19                  Q. All right. The bottom of page 27, a  
20                  grand opening advertisement.

21                  A. Right.

22                  Q. Sitting here today, do you know whether  
23                  ABC One Hour Cleaners was in operation on June 28,  
24                  1954?

25                  MS. HURT: Objection to form.

1           A. I see now. Thank you.

2           Q. Have you revised any of your opinions  
3 since the date of the February 7th, 2025, report?

4           A. Well, you previously asked and as I  
5 responded, Dr. Longley did correct the errors --  
6 Dr. Longley's most recent report he made  
7 corrections to some of the errors that I pointed  
8 out in this report, if that makes sense.

9           Q. Yes, sir. On page 1, you say -- first  
10 numbered paragraph, you talk about three instances  
11 where you say that: Dr. Longley entirely and  
12 egregiously misrepresents the source material;  
13 correct?

14           A. Which point was that under, sir? Okay,  
15 thank you.

16           Q. We talked about it earlier. You find  
17 three instances where Dr. Longley's report was  
18 incorrect. The first was the Nixon photo, the  
19 second one was the demonstrative photo of water  
20 buffalos at Hadnot Point, and the third was the  
21 date range for the Holcomb water plant. Are those  
22 the three instances you are talking about?

23           A. Yes, they are.

24           Q. And your understanding is he has sought  
25 to correct those three in his subsequent report?

1           A.     Yes.

2           Q.     Okay.   Now page 1, the numbered  
3       paragraph 2 --

4           A.     Okay.

5           Q.     -- at the end of it you say -- first  
6       page: Although Hadnot Point is the center of many  
7       activities at Camp Lejeune, there are other areas,  
8       et cetera.

9           So you will agree with me, correct, that  
10      during our historical time period Hadnot Point was  
11      the center of many activities at Camp Lejeune?

12           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

13           THE WITNESS: Yes, I have never denied  
14      that.

15           BY MR. HUGHES:

16           Q.     Top of page 2, you note -- you discussed  
17      other water treatment plants, the ones aside from  
18      Hadnot and Tarawa. And you said the ATSDR did not  
19      conclude that those other water treatment plants  
20      were further contaminated; correct?

21           A.     That's what I said.

22           Q.     Having said that, you are not aware of  
23      whether there were significant levels of  
24      trichloromethane found in the New River Air  
25      Station system in the early 1980s; correct?

1           Q.     Do you agree that there are things in  
2     Dr. Longley's report that are not included in your  
3     report?

4           A.     I would say quite a bit.

5           Q.     And there are things in your report that  
6     are not in Dr. Longley's report; correct?

7           A.     Again, I would say there is quite a bit.

8           Q.     On page 3 of your second report, towards  
9     the bottom you cite to Mike Magner's book. Do you  
10    see that?

11          A.     Yes, I'd do: A Trust Betrayed.

12          Q.     Did you read the book?

13          A.     I have the book. I reviewed it. I'm  
14     not going to say I read it word by word. When I  
15     purchased these books, I was looking for  
16     historical information.

17          Q.     Did you find Mike Magner's book to be  
18     reliable as far as you could tell?

19           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

20           THE WITNESS: I just don't recall. It's  
21     been nearly a year ago.

22           BY MR. HUGHES:

23          Q.     Okay. But you did cite it in your  
24     report; correct?

25          A.     I certainly listed it here. I don't

1 recall if I cited it in the body of my report.

2 Q. Fair enough. And then on page 4 -- this  
3 is your second report February 2nd, 2025 -- top of  
4 page 4, you cite to reports prepared by ATSDR;  
5 correct?

6 A. Yes, I do.

7 Q. Including a summary of the water  
8 contamination situation at Camp Lejeune dated 2024  
9 from the website; correct?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And the Maslia publication in the  
12 journal called Water from 2016; correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And there is no caveat here. In other  
15 words, I don't see here whether as a historian you  
16 commented that either one of these publications  
17 was not entirely reliable; correct?

18 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

19 THE WITNESS: I did not say that.

20 BY MR. HUGHES:

21 Q. As far as you know, those two  
22 publications are entirely reliable; correct?

23 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

24 THE WITNESS: I certainly think they are  
25 reliable.

1                   THE WITNESS: Yeah, corroborative  
2                   sources would good.

3                   BY MR. HUGHES:

4                   Q. And you understand since the time of his  
5                   first report, Dr. Longley, he's endeavored to do  
6                   more work. He, for example, took the formal oral  
7                   history recording of Mr. Partain and  
8                   Mr. Ensminger, which has been provided; correct?

9                   A. Yes.

10                  Q. On page 13 of your report, you see  
11                  numbered paragraph 6?

12                  A. Yes.

13                  Q. Okay. And it talks about six lines  
14                  down, how the depositions were taken in 2024 -- or  
15                  the declaration was in 2024, but that was four  
16                  years after the individuals were at Lejeune. You  
17                  see that?

18                  A. Yes.

19                  Q. And as we discussed, you are aware now  
20                  that on the U.S. Marines official website there  
21                  are oral histories of individuals that relate to  
22                  historical events going all the way back to World  
23                  War II; correct?

24                  A. Yes.

25                  Q. And so clearly, in some cases oral

1 histories can be of oral historians who are being  
2 asked to recall events from decades earlier and it  
3 can be a meaningful and valuable process; correct?

4 MS. HURT: Objection to form.

5 THE WITNESS: That's correct. That is  
6 exactly what I was saying in the paragraph just  
7 discussed.

8 BY MR. HUGHES:

9 Q. Well, what -- tell me what you are  
10 saying. I was focused on the reference to  
11 40 years after.

12 A. Okay. The deposition was taken in 2024,  
13 and the declarations were written 2024, some  
14 40 years after these individuals were at Camp  
15 Lejeune. So that is certainly the case.

16 My concern, what I was pointing out was  
17 really the last sentence where I wrote: Without  
18 additional source material, Dr. Longley cannot  
19 make assertions about what transpired at other  
20 times during the 34-year statutory period.

21 So this goes to something else we were  
22 talking about, point-in-time references.  
23 Sometimes they are very, very good at telling us  
24 exactly what happened at a given time in history.  
25 But I think all historians, we have to be careful

1       we don't extrapolate too much from those types of  
2       documents.

3           Q.    Okay. So one phrase there to focus on  
4       is "additional source material"? Right?

5           A.    Yes.

6           Q.    And that goes back to what we talked  
7       about about additional source material can be  
8       helpful; correct?

9           A.    Yes.

10          Q.    All right. Then if we go to page 18 on  
11       this report.

12          A.    I'm there.

13          Q.    On page 18, we see the screenshot from  
14       Longley's first report where he had a photo of the  
15       water treatment plant near Holcomb Boulevard and  
16       it was captioned 1960s. But you went behind -- or  
17       your team did -- and you found that fact-checking  
18       it, actually that picture was from August 10th,  
19       1972; correct?

20          A.    That's correct.

21          Q.    And so your point -- one of your points  
22       is that the photo is actually of the Holcomb  
23       Boulevard plant in '72, while that is also  
24       consistent with what we read from the ATSDR about  
25       when the Holcomb plant opened; correct?

1           Q. Right. And you considered it relevant  
2         to this issue of when ABC Dry Cleaners started;  
3         right?

4           A. Absolutely.

5           Q. But that work -- to your knowledge, no  
6         work like that was done back in 2012; right?

7           MS. HURT: Objection to form and  
8         foundation.

9           THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge, no.  
10          BY MR. HUGHES:

11          Q. And as of 2012, if you look at page 6 of  
12         Dr. Longley's report, the VA was actually using  
13         the Partain website to train it's own people.

14          MS. HURT: Objection to form and  
15         foundation.

16          BY MR. HUGHES:

17          Q. You see the VA slide on page 6; right?

18          A. I'm looking at it right now.

19          Q. Did you all fact-check this? Do we  
20         know? Did you fact-check this?

21          A. This should have been fact-checked, yes.

22          Q. And do you have any reason to critique  
23         it or dispute it sitting here today?

24          MS. HURT: Objection to form.

25          THE WITNESS: I have no reason to think

1           Q. And on the timeline they would have  
2       seen, if they looked long enough, the reference to  
3       ABC starting in 1953; correct?

4           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

5           THE WITNESS: Yes, looking at it, they  
6       would have.

7           BY MR. HUGHES:

8           Q. Look at page 13, if you will. Do you  
9       see a bigger image of the bus schedule on page 13?

10          A. Yes.

11          Q. This one is the youth activities bus  
12       schedule; correct? It says it at the top.

13          A. Yes.

14          Q. And this is cited as coming from The  
15       Globe, July 26, 1962; right?

16          A. Right.

17          Q. You all would have fact-checked it?

18          A. Yes.

19          Q. And sitting here today, you don't have a  
20       critique; correct?

21          A. No, I don't.

22          Q. And if we go to page 14, you see a photo  
23       from The Globe from '83 showing a cultural event,  
24       the Guess Who rock band at Camp Lejeune; right?

25          A. Yes, indeed.

1           Q. If you go to page 16, you can see a  
2 picture of the bowling alley at Hadnot in 1964  
3 from The Globe; right?

4           A. Yes.

5           Q. And y'all fact-checked that as well?

6           A. Correct.

7           Q. Page 17, the cattle cars. Now, in  
8 Longley's report here he says: Brigham also omits  
9 mention of cattle cars. Do you see that sentence,  
10 page 17?

11          A. Yes, that's just what I was reading.

12          Q. Is that true? Did you omit mention of  
13 cattle cars in your first report?

14          A. I did not discuss cattle cars.

15          Q. Why not?

16          A. Well, again, it really was not what I  
17 was tasked to do in my report.

18          Q. Your report talks about travel.

19          A. Well, yes, it does. But it's really  
20 more the areas of the base.

21          Q. Which the cattle cars would go to?

22          A. That's true.

23          Q. But your point is the omission was not  
24 malicious in nature; right?

25          A. No.

1 at 14:34.

2 (Whereupon, the deposition was recessed  
3 from 2:34 p.m. to 2:43 p.m.)

4 We are on the record at 14:43.

5 BY MR. HUGHES:

6 Q. Dr. Brigham, let's mark and show you  
7 Exhibit Number 6.

8 (Whereupon, Deposition Exhibit  
9 No. 6 was marked for  
10 identification.)

11 MY MR. HUGHES:

12 Q. I will represent this is a copy of  
13 Dr. Longley's report dated March 17th, 2025. Have  
14 you seen this one before?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. All right. Have you and your group done  
17 fact-checking on it to your knowledge?

18 A. We have reviewed it. My staff, we've  
19 gone through it. I'm not sure of the degree of  
20 fact-checking we did on the first report.

21 Q. Are there any Nixon type inaccuracies in  
22 it as we sit here today that you are aware of?

23 A. None come to mind right now.

24 Q. If you look at page 2, first full  
25 paragraph beginning "It is noteworthy..." do you

1       months? Am I doing my math right? It would be an  
2       awful lot to do to get an expert report together  
3       in four months. I had a lot of people doing a lot  
4       of different things.

5           Q. Okay. All right. So from a perspective  
6       of being an expert historian in a case, four  
7       months -- if you had your druthers, you would  
8       rather have more than four months to do a project  
9       like this; is that true?

10          A. It is true. Because there are many  
11       things in historical research that are out of the  
12       historian's control, like how many hours can you  
13       work at the Archives? How many hours can you go  
14       to the Library of Congress? You don't want to be  
15       gone forever. But four-month would be a very  
16       tight schedule. Obviously that changed, which was  
17       helpful.

18          Q. If you look at page 25 going to 26 of  
19       this report from Dr. Longley, do you see the  
20       string cites with excerpts from other oral  
21       histories on the U.S. Marines website?

22          A. You said 25 on to 26?

23          Q. Yes.

24          A. Yes, I see this. I've seen this before.

25          Q. And you can see how it is referencing

1       here things like the commissary, NCOs, Tarawa  
2       Terrace, et cetera; correct?

3           A.    Yes, I see those things you just  
4       mentioned.

5           Q.    Would you agree that culling this sort  
6       of information can be useful in terms of  
7       historical methodology on a topic like the history  
8       of Lejeune and the water contamination and water  
9       use at Lejeune?

10          MS. HURT: Objection to form.

11           THE WITNESS: Yes, it certainly could  
12       prove useful.

13          BY MR. HUGHES:

14          Q.    At page 27, do you see the notes for the  
15       Allan Howard witness dated August 2024? Do you  
16       see that?

17          A.    Yes, toward the bottom, yes.

18          Q.    Now, as I understand your testimony, a  
19       formal full-fledged oral history would have a  
20       recording and a transcript. It wouldn't be just  
21       be paraphrase or a summary; correct?

22          A.    Correct.

23          Q.    However, you will agree that a  
24       historian, it's not required for a historian have  
25       to have a reliable methodology for him only to use

1           A. Yes.

2           Q. But you would also agree that  
3           Mr. Partain can still be a reliable public  
4           historian, notwithstanding the fact that he came  
5           to a different conclusion than you did as to the  
6           start date?

7           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

8           THE WITNESS: Yes. In the instance of  
9           ABC One Hour Cleaners, my choice of June of 1954  
10          is based on the research that my staff and I did.

11          BY MR. HUGHES:

12          Q. I understand. Do you think that someone  
13          needs to have a Ph.D. in history to be qualified  
14          as an expert in history for court purposes?

15          A. No, I know people who don't have Ph.D.s  
16          who have given testimony in court.

17          Q. As historians?

18          A. Yes.

19          Q. As historian experts?

20          A. Yes.

21          Q. Give me an example.

22          A. A number of years ago I had a  
23          navigability for title project, and a person from  
24          a firm similar to MorganAngelBrigham testified and  
25          the individual had his master's degree.

1           Q. From what you've seen of Mr. Partain,  
2 could he be qualified as a historian expert?

3           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

4 Foundation.

5           THE WITNESS: I can't say one way or  
6 another. I'd have to just do more review.

7 BY MR. HUGHES:

8           Q. Okay. Well, we encourage you to do  
9 that. If you look at page 6 going into page 7 of  
10 his report, at the bottom of page 6, he says: A  
11 final goal of this paper and project is to  
12 memorialize this work in an academic database such  
13 as the University of Central Florida's  
14 STARS(Showcase of Text, Archives, Research and  
15 Scholarship) Digital Repository and preserve the  
16 Camp Lejeune Community Digital Archive in a  
17 sustainable manner for future scholars to utilize.  
18 Do you see that language?

19           A. Yes.

20           Q. From what you have seen of the The Few  
21 and the Proud website, would you agree with me  
22 that it has useful historical information on it?

23           MS. HURT: Objection to form.

24           THE WITNESS: Yes.

25 BY MR. HUGHES: